



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,766	03/26/2004	Geoffrey R. Kruse	M61.12-0629	9088
27366	7590	09/12/2008	EXAMINER	
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)			CAO, PHUONG THAO	
SUITE 1400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH			2164	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3244			MAIL DATE	
			09/12/2008	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/810,766	KRUSE ET AL.
	Examiner Phuong-Thao Cao	Art Unit 2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4-18 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1, 4-8 and 20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/0256/06)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Amendment/RCE filed on 07/02/2008 and entered with an RCE.
2. Claims 1, 8 and 18 have been amended, claims 21-23 have been cancelled, and claims 2, 3 and 19 were previously cancelled. Currently, claims 1, 4-18 and 20 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/02/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-8 and 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 8-10 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "the account staging table" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 9 and 10 reciting "the account staging table" in line 2 are rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of claim 8 upon which they depend.

Claim 13 recites the limitation "the account staging table" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 14 and 15 reciting "the account staging table" in line 2 are rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of claim 13 upon which they depend.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 1, 4-18 and 20 (effective filing date 3/26/2004) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bedell et al. (US Patent No 6,996,568; effective filing date 04/11/2002) in view of Thompson et al. (US Patent No 6,668,253; effective filing date 9/8/1999).

As to claim 1, Bedell et al. teaches:

“A computer system that includes components stored on a computer storage medium” (see Bedell et al., Abstract and Fig. 1), the components comprising:

“a uniform interface configured to receive a generalized request from a report object and, based upon information included in the generalized request, access data from a database and return the accessed data to the report object, the report object being configured to operate without directly accessing the database” (see Bedell et al., Fig. 1 and [column 2, lines 26-30] wherein user engine is interpreted as report object and analysis engine is interpreted as uniform interface as recited),

“wherein at least one staging table, having a standardized structure which is independent of a structure of the database, is utilized by the uniform interface to store at least a portion of the accessed data” (see Bedell et al., [column 7, lines 29-31] for temporary table which is interpreted as Applicant’s “staging table”; also see [column 6, lines 30-38] for processing results (accessed data) returned from databases at the analysis engine before returned to user engine),

“wherein the uniform interface is further configured to access the data from the database by translating the generalized request into a specific query which, upon execution, populates the at least one staging table with the accessed data” (see Bedell et al., [column 2, lines 26-30] wherein report request is interpreted as generalized request and SQL queries is interpreted as specific query; and see [column 7, lines 29-31] for using temporary table to process the data from database), and

“wherein the uniform interface is further configured to, in response to the generalized request, query the at least one staging table to retrieve the accessed data and to return the accessed data to the report object after execution of the specific query that populates the at least

one staging table" (see Bedell et al., [column 6 lines 10-38] for processing results at analytical engine (uniform interface) before returned to the user engine (report object) wherein any storage structure for the results at the analytical engine during processing (e.g., a plurality of analytical measures, filters, thresholds, statistical or other treatment, etc.) is interpreted as equivalent to staging table).

However, Bedell et al. does not teach the database as a general ledger database.

On the other hand, Thompson et al. teach a general ledger database (see Thompson et al., [column 25, lines 29-33]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system of Collins by the teaching of Thompson et al. by modifying the system of Bedell et al. to use with the general ledger database. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so as suggested by Bedell et al., [column 5, lines 25-28] that user can use the system to request for report on financial account. Accessing and reporting data from a general ledger database using the system of Bedell et al. allows user with effective way to access reports regarding financial information.

As to claim 4, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bedell et al. and Thompson et al. teach:

"wherein the at least one staging table is an account code table" (see Thompson et al., [column 25, lines 44-47] for Account Tables).

As to claim 5, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bedell et al. and Thompson et al. teach:

“wherein at least one staging table is an account balance staging table” (see Thompson et al., [column 25, lines 60-65] for Financial Account Balance Table).

As to claim 6, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bedell et al. and Thompson et al. teach:

“wherein the at least one staging table is a column filter staging table” (see Thompson et al., [column 11, lines 9-12] for a list of predefined query filters which is equivalent to Applicant’s “column filter staging table”).

As to claim 7, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bedell et al. and Thompson et al. teach:

“wherein the generalized request includes at least one natural account is translated into at least one account code, which is stored in an account balance staging table” (see Thompson et al., Fig. 25A for account sequence which is equivalent to Applicant’s “account code”).

As to claim 8, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 7 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bedell et al. and Thompson et al. teach:

“wherein the specific query, into which the generalized request is translated by the uniform interface, comprises a single sequential query language (SQL) statement that joins the account staging table with a balance table of the general ledger database, such that balance information for an entire report column is retrieved by execution of the single SQL statement” (see Thompson et al., [column 31, lines 35-60]).

As to claim 9, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bedell et al. and Thompson et al. teach:

“wherein the balance information comprises current balance amounts for each account code in the account staging table” (see Thompson et al., [column 25, lines 60-65] wherein each of GL accounts is equivalent to Applicant’s “account code” and account balances is equivalent to Applicant’s “balance amounts”, and Fig. 25C for balance amount item).

As to claim 10, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bedell et al. and Thompson et al. teach:

“wherein the balance information comprises year-to-date balance amounts for each account code in the account staging table” (see Thompson et al., [column 30-35 and 60-65] wherein each of GL accounts is equivalent to Applicant’s “account code” and account balances

is equivalent to Applicant's "balance amounts", and Fig. 25C for EOY beginning balance and EOY ending balance which is equivalent to Applicant's "year-to-date balance").

As to claim 11, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bedell et al. and Thompson et al. teach:

"wherein the generalized request further comprises account filter criteria, and wherein a WHERE clause of the single SQL statement is configured to include the account filter criteria" (see Thompson et al., [column 10, lines 1-15 and 40-45] and [column 26, lines 30-40] for the function of filtering information including financial information).

As to claim 12, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bedell et al. and Thompson et al. teach:

"wherein the generalized request includes at least one natural account and account filter criteria, and wherein, with the help of the uniform interface, the at least one natural account is translated into at least one account code, which is stored in an account balance staging table, and wherein account codes that match the account filter criteria are stored in a column filter staging table" (see Thompson et al., Fig. 25A for account sequence which is equivalent to Applicant's "account code", and see [column 11, lines 9-15] and [column 10, lines 1-15] for filtering information and see [column 25, lines 20-60] and Fig. 25A for account number which is

equivalent to Applicant's "natural account" and account sequence which is equivalent to Applicant's "account code").

As to claim 13, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 12 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bedell et al. and Thompson et al. teach:

"wherein the specific query, into which the generalized request is translated by the uniform interface, comprises a single sequential query language (SQL) statement that joins the account staging table with the column filter staging table and with a balance table of the general ledger database, such that balance information for an entire report column can be retrieved by execution of the single SQL statement" (see Thompson et al., [column 26, lines 30-45] and [column 31, lines 35-45] for ability to combine the financial information which is equivalent to Applicant's "joins").

As to claim 14, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bedell et al. and Thompson et al. teach:

"wherein the balance information comprises current balance amounts for each account code in the account staging table" (see Thompson et al., [column 25, lines 30-35 and 60-65] wherein each of GL accounts is equivalent to Applicant's "account code" and account balances is equivalent to Applicant's "balance amounts", and Fig. 25C for balance amount item).

As to claim 15, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bedell et al. and Thompson et al. teach:

“wherein the balance information comprises year-to-date balance amounts for each account code in the account staging table” (see Thompson et al., [column 30-35 and 60-65] wherein each of GL accounts is equivalent to Applicant’s “account code” and account balances is equivalent to Applicant’s “balance amounts”, and Fig. 25C for EOY beginning balance and EOY ending balance which is equivalent to Applicant’s “year-to-date balance”).

As to claim 16, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bedell et al. and Thompson et al. teach:

“wherein the at least one staging table is a temporary table” (see Thompson et al., [column 25, lines 15-17] wherein a Summary Temporary Table is a temporary staging table).

As to claim 17, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bedell et al. and Thompson et al. teach:

“wherein the at least one staging table is a permanent table” (see Thompson et al., [column 25, lines 17-22] wherein a Summary (permanent) Table is a permanent staging table).

As to claim 18, Bedell et al. teach:

“A computer implemented method of retrieving data, from a database, to satisfy a generalized request from a report object” (see Bedell et al., Abstract, Fig. 1 and [column 2, lines 26-30] wherein user engine is interpreted as report object and analysis engine is interpreted as uniform interface as recited), comprising:

“receiving the generalized request from the report object” (see Bedell et al., [column 6, lines 1-11] wherein request for information from user engine is interpreted as the generalized request);

“accessing, based on information included in the generalized request, data from the database” (see Bedell et al., [column 6, lines 10-21]);

“utilizing at least one staging table, having a standardized structure which is independent of a structure of the database, to store at least a portion of the accessed data on a computer storage medium before it is returned to the report object from the staging table in response to the generalized request” (see Bedell et al., [column 7, lines 29-31] for temporary table which is interpreted as Applicant’s “staging table”; also see [column 6, lines 30-38] for processing results (accessed data) returned from databases at the analysis engine before returned to user engine),

“wherein the report object is configured to operate without directly accessing the database” (see Bedell et al., Fig. 1 wherein the user engine accesses databases through analytical engine).

However, Bedell et al. does not teach the database as a general ledger database.

On the other hand, Thompson et al. teach a general ledger database (see Thompson et al., [column 25, lines 29-33]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system of Collins by the teaching of Thompson et al. by modifying the system of Bedell et al. to use with the general ledger database. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so as suggested by Bedell et al., [column 5, lines 25-28] that user can use the system to request for report on financial account. Accessing and reporting data from a general ledger database using the system of Bedell et al. allows user with effective way to access reports regarding financial information.

As to claim 20, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 18 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bedell et al. and Thompson et al. teach:

“wherein the at least one staging table is a temporary table” (see Thompson et al., [column 25, lines 15-17] wherein a Summary Temporary Table is a temporary staging table; also see Bedell et al., [column 7, lines 28-30]).

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Nishizawa et al. (US Patent No 6,694,306; effective filing date 09/19/2000) teaches a system which includes a data processing system which accesses data from databases, stores accessed data on its temporary tables before returning accessed data to requester (see Fig. 1, [column 9, lines 7-15] and [column 10, lines 15-25 and 40-65]).

Dalal et al. (US Patent No 5,701,461; publication date 12/23/1997) teaches a system which allowed accessed data from database accessed through temporary table (see Fig. 2, Fig. 4 and [column 7, lines 45-55]).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571)272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hung T Vy/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2163

Phuong-Thao Cao, Examiner
Art Unit 2164
September 5, 2008

Application/Control Number: 10/810,766
Art Unit: 2164

Page 16